

3356

No. 20149

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JOSEPH M. ARAGON,
Plaintiff and Appellant,
v.
R. A. WATHEN and C. A. YOUNG,
Defendants and Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court,
Southern District, Central Division

HONORABLE LEON R. YANKWICH, JUDGE

APPELLEES' BRIEF

THOMAS C. LYNCH, Attorney General
WILLIAM E. JAMES,
Assistant Attorney General
DAVID S. SPERBER,
Deputy Attorney General
600 State Building
Los Angeles, California 90012

Attorneys for Appellees

FILED
JUL 1 1965



TOPICAL INDEX

Pages

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	1-3
STATEMENT OF FACTS	3
SPECIFICATION OF ERROR	3
SUMMARY OF APPELLEES' ARGUMENT	3
ARGUMENT	4
THE COMPLAINT WAS PROPERLY DISMISSED	4
CONCLUSION	5
CERTIFICATE	5

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes that this is essential for ensuring transparency and accountability in the organization's operations.

2. The second part outlines the specific procedures and protocols that must be followed when recording and reporting data. This includes details on how to collect, analyze, and present information in a clear and concise manner.

3. The third part addresses the role of technology in streamlining the data management process. It highlights the benefits of using specialized software and tools to automate repetitive tasks and improve the overall efficiency of the system.

4. Finally, the document concludes by stressing the need for ongoing training and education for all staff members involved in the data management process. This ensures that everyone is up-to-date on the latest best practices and technologies, and is able to contribute effectively to the organization's success.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	Pages
Curtis v. Jacques, 130 F. Supp. 920	4
Pugliano v. Staziak, 231 F. Supp. 347	4
United States v. Ragen, 213 F. 2d 294	4
United States v. Radio Station WENR, 209 F. 2d 105	4
Tabor v. Hardwick, 224 F. 2d 526	4

STATUTES

California Penal Code, § 2600 et seq.	4
18 U.S.C. § 241	2,4
28 U.S.C. § 1291	1
§ 1294	1
§ 1331	3,4
§ 1343	1,3,4
42 U.S.C. § 1983	3,4
§ 1985	3,4

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE

TO THE HONORABLE COMMISSIONERS OF REVENUE

IN CONNECTION WITH THE REPORT OF THE

COMMISSIONERS OF REVENUE FOR THE YEAR

ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1917.

MISSISSIPPI, 1918.

CONTENTS

1	GENERAL STATEMENT OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF REVENUE
10	REVENUE FROM TAXES
15	REVENUE FROM LICENSES
20	REVENUE FROM FEES
25	REVENUE FROM SINKING FUND
30	REVENUE FROM MISCELLANEOUS SOURCES
35	REVENUE FROM DEBENTURES
40	REVENUE FROM BONDS
45	REVENUE FROM STOCKS
50	REVENUE FROM REAL ESTATE
55	REVENUE FROM PERSONAL PROPERTY
60	REVENUE FROM INHERITANCE
65	REVENUE FROM ESTATE TAXES
70	REVENUE FROM SALES TAX
75	REVENUE FROM TRANSFER TAX
80	REVENUE FROM PROFESSIONAL FEES
85	REVENUE FROM BUSINESS TAXES
90	REVENUE FROM TAXES ON PROFESSIONALS
95	REVENUE FROM TAXES ON BUSINESS
100	REVENUE FROM TAXES ON PROFESSIONALS AND BUSINESS

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JOSEPH M. ARAGON,
Plaintiff and Appellant,
v.
R. A. WATHEN and C. A. YOUNG,
Defendants and Appellees.

No. 20149

APPELLEES' BRIEF

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

The United States District Court's jurisdiction to entertain plaintiff's complaint rested on 28 U.S.C. § 1343. This court has jurisdiction to review that court's order dismissing appellant's complaint. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1291, 1294.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

In a complaint "OF CIVIL RIGHTS DEPRIVATION" filed February 4, 1965, in the United States District Court, Southern District of California, Central Division, plaintiff alleged he was deprived of the right to convert class E Government Bonds into cash "as a result of a wilful and felonious conspiracy by the said defendant's [sic], denying plaintiff his CIVIL RIGHTS which he is entitled to as an AMERICAN CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES" in violation

of 18 U.S.C. § 241. (Complaint p. 3.)

On February 10, 1965, in the United States District Court, Southern District of California, Central Division, the Honorable Leon R. Yankwich ordered appellant's complaint be dismissed on the ground it failed to show appellant was entitled to the relief sought. (Order Dismissing Complaint, p. 1.) The Court also stated:

"The petitioner is held by virtue of process issued by a state court. We cannot in this proceeding review that judgment, which has become final." (Order Dismissing Complaint, p. 4.)

The Court also noted that according to its records appellant had been charged in a complaint with violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act. (Order Dismissing Complaint, p. 1.) Pursuant to that complaint, a stipulated judgment was entered into by appellant personally, and by his counsel, with the United States Department of Labor. (Order Dismissing Complaint, p. 2.) The Court noted, "In view of this broad stipulation the petitioner cannot be heard to say, as he does in this petition, that he was deprived of any rights." (Order Dismissing Complaint, pp. 3, 4.)

On March 22, 1965, in the United States District Court, Southern District of California, Central Division, the Honorable Leon R. Yankwich vacated the order of February 10, 1965, which dismissed the complaint, on

the ground that reference was made to a Fair Labor Standards case in which it was mistakenly believed appellant was a party. Thereupon the court entered an order dismissing appellant's complaint on the ground it failed to show appellant was entitled to the relief sought, stating:

"The petitioner is held by virtue of process issued by a state court. We cannot in this proceeding review that judgment, which has become final."

On April 14, 1965, appellant filed a Notice of Appeal from the "judgment and order" of March 22, 1965.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Testimony was not taken, the matter being decided on the pleadings.

SPECIFICATION OF ERROR

Appellant contends:

1. The District Court erred in "denying generally the allegations of the complaint."
2. The District Court had jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1343, 1331.
3. The District Court had jurisdiction under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985.

SUMMARY OF APPELLEES' ARGUMENT

Appellant fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

Faint, illegible text at the top of the page, possibly a header or introductory paragraph.

Main body of faint, illegible text, appearing to be several paragraphs of a document.

Faint text at the bottom of the page, possibly a signature or footer.

ARGUMENT

THE COMPLAINT WAS PROPERLY DISMISSED

Appellant does not state a claim upon which relief may be granted under 18 U.S.C. § 241. Pugliano v. Staziak, 231 F. Supp. 347, 349 (Footnote) (W.D. Pa. 1964).

While appellant does not mention any other sections of the Civil Rights Act in his complaint, in his Notice of Appeal he seeks to invoke these sections -- 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343; 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985. Even considering these sections, appellant has failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. He alleges he desired to convert a Government Bond in his possession to cash and was denied that right by prison authorities. Appellant has lost his civil rights by virtue of being sentenced to state prison. Calif. Pen. Code § 2600 et seq. In any event, matters of this character are questions of prison discipline which do not involve a federal question. Tabor v. Hardwick, 224 F. 2d 526, 529 (5th Cir. 1955); United States v. Ragen, 213 F. 2d 294, 295 (7th Cir. 1954); United States v. Radio Station WENR, 209 F. 2d 105, 107 (7th Cir. 1953); Curtis v. Jacques, 130 F. Supp. 920, 921 (Dist. Ct. Mich. 1954).

CONCLUSION

The trial court properly dismissed appellant's complaint. The order should be affirmed.

Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS C. LYNCH, Attorney General
WILLIAM E. JAMES,
Assistant Attorney General
DAVID S. SPERBER,
Deputy Attorney General

By DAVID S. SPERBER
DAVID S. SPERBER
Deputy Attorney General

Attorneys for Appellees

CERTIFICATE

I certify that, in connection with the preparation of this brief, I have examined Rules 18 and 19 of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and that in my opinion, the foregoing brief is in full compliance with those Rules.

DAVID S. SPERBER
DAVID S. SPERBER
Deputy Attorney General

DSS:bj
7/16/65
24 CR LA
65-488

